



Memorandum

TO: COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC
PLAN TASK FORCE

FROM: Sal Yakubu

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 4/19/05

DATE: April 29, 2005

Approved

Date

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Jerry Amaro (Victory Outreach Church), Shanna Boigon (Association of Realtors), Mark Frederick (County Parks), Jane Mark (County Parks), Mike Griffis (County Roads), Mary Hughes (Habitat for Humanity), Wingate Lew (Caltrans), Libby Lucas (CA Native Plant Society), Dennis Martin (Home Builders Association), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Mike Tasosa (VTA) and Rebecca Van Dahlen (Association of Realtors).

City and Other Public Agency Staff Present:

Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE) and Sylvia Do (PBCE).

Consultants and Members of the Public:

Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers) and Jim Thompson (HMH Engineers).

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting convened at 3:00 p.m. with introductions around the room. Susan Walsh, Senior Planner with the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement (PBCE) Department, provided an overview of the agenda. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) bicycle, pedestrian and transit connections and movements.

2. Update on CVSP

Susan provided an overview of the third progress report presented to the City Council on April 5, 2005. Council directed staff to provide an information memorandum to the Rules Committee explaining the range of EIR alternatives to be analyzed. The Rules Committee will determine if any further public review of the EIR alternatives is necessary. Susan indicated that the EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) would be distributed in late May 2005. The draft EIR (DEIR) is expected to be available by September 2005.

3. Overview of the CVSP Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Connections and Movements

Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the PBCE Department, provided an overview of the CVSP process and the Composite Infrastructure Plan.

Susan provided an overview of the major connections between the neighborhoods and the regional network. The CVSP incorporates five themes necessary for a livable and walkable community—bicycle and pedestrian movements, bicycle and pedestrian connections, bicycle and pedestrian connections to transit, and permeable parkway and trails.

Jim Thompson (HMH Engineers) provided an overview of a Transportation and Circulation Technical Memorandum, which is being developed by staff and consultants for the CVSP. The technical memorandum details the objectives, components, technical issues, design criteria, regulatory issues and environmental issues related to the extensive system of parks, trails and recreational area planned in Coyote Valley.

The TAC provided the following questions and comments:

- Indication that at the April 11, 2005 Task Force meeting, Task Force member Helen Chapman indicated that the City Parks and Recreation Commission would support City and County-wide trail systems.
- New York City's Central Park was well done and the trails should be researched.
- Sometimes it is better to put trails and paths in after a development has been in to benefit from people's walking patterns.

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of TAC Meeting

April 19, 2005

Page 3 of 5

- Will trails be counted for towards the park dedication requirement? *Staff is meeting with the City's Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services (PRNS) Department to determine this issue.*
- Are costs of the trails included in the preliminary infrastructure costs? *Jim responded in the affirmative.*
- Indication that the trails can be phased so that developers do not have to pay for them upfront. Recommended evaluating what are musts versus wants. *Jim indicated that outside funding is currently estimated at \$2 million for trails.*
- Who will be responsible for the trail? *The trail would be a part of the public realm. The details of the operations and maintenance strategy is not resolved yet.*
- County and City should share maintenance responsibility for the trail on the west side of Coyote Creek.
- Why is the trail along the west side of Coyote Creek not in Santa Clara County property? *Roger Shanks, with Dahlin Group, explained that a new trail is proposed on the west side of Coyote Creek. This would limit the impact on the Coyote Creek.*
- Will the new trail on the west side of Coyote Creek have adequate capacity for urban development? *Mark indicated that the County Parks and Recreational Department is creating a Coyote Creek Parkway Master Plan. County Parks and will work to ensure adequate trail capacity. They would also like to maintain a wildlife corridor on one side of the corridor. They would like to maximize recreational activity on one side of Coyote Creek, preferably on the side with urban development.*
- When will there be discussion about housing development? Concerned with issues relative to the development along the east side Monterey Highway and its interface with Coyote Creek Parkway. *Susan indicated that staff and the consultants are meeting with PRNS on the character of development and setbacks along the east side on Coyote Creek.*
- What is the setback between the trail and Coyote Creek Parkway? *Susan stated that the City's riparian corridor policy requires a 100 feet minimum setback from the top of the bank or the edge of riparian vegetation, which ever is greater. The city has been meeting with the County Parks and Recreation Department to discuss the location of trails and the frontage road along the Coyote Creek Parkway.*
- Additional setback is needed to protect the Coyote Creek Parkway.
- What is the width of the frontage road along Coyote Creek? *The frontage road would be a 32 feet wide 2-lane road. The frontage road represents the ultimate limit of development. It allows development to front the trail and Coyote Creek Parkway to ensure safety and encourage trail usage.*
- Other than transportation uses, what other types of amenities would be along the trails? *Suggestion that public art could be incorporated into the natural environmental (e.g. the Guadalupe River Park). Jim indicated that the Coyote Valley Research Park (CVRP) incorporated amenities along its proposed trails. Roger indicated that public art could also be displayed on the trail system along the lake.*
- Need to consider trash collection along trails.
- Need to consider safety issues for trail designs. Lighting is an issue for trails.
- Trails should be safe to encourage usage by children.

- Concerned with multi-use trails. Indication that there are conflicts between dogs and bicyclists. Bicyclists should be separated since they can use roadways.
- Is there really a need for equestrian trails? *There is a lot of interest from Morgan Hill area residents for equestrian facilities.*
- Where are the existing equestrian trails located? *Mark Frederick, with County Parks, indicated that there is an equestrian trail on the east side of Coyote Creek. There are not many users in the north because floods have washed out horse stables and parts of the previously continuous trail. There are not a lot of defined trails. People tend to use the old trails and make up their own. County Parks is working on the Coyote Creek Parkway Master Plan to provide for adequate equestrian trails.*
- Need to look at equestrian use for riders of all levels.
- Urban trails are not intended for novice equestrians.
- Equestrian trails should not be paved.
- Recommended creating a separate trail for equestrian because bicyclists can scare horses.
- Mark Frederick, with County parks, indicated that there have been few accidents between bicyclists and horses in County parks.
- Separate trails cannot be provided for every use. *Jim stated that separate trails would be provided where they can be accommodated.*
- Indication that the intersection of Santa Teresa Boulevard and the parkway is a bad location for an equestrian crossing. Recommended creating a continuous trail network by using the bypass around Laguna Seca to connect to the De Anza trail.
- How would students get to school? Indication that there is a safety issue. *Roger explained that this depends on where the students live. In most cases, students can walk, bike or take transit to school. Streets are designed to accommodate bicyclists. Transit use is particularly encouraged for high school students. Each school has designated drop-off areas. Sal indicated that the community is designed for Walkability and convenient access to transit.*
- Indication that high school students will drive to school if their parents buy them cars.

4. Open Forum/Other Issues

- Is the wildlife corridor in the north still being considered? Indicated a need for a wildlife corridor with an east-west connection by Tulare Hill.
- How will the CVSP be financially feasible? Concerned that this would have an impact on the ability to provide affordable housing.
- Indicated that it is critical to integrate affordable housing throughout the community. Concerned that potential concentration of affordable housing could impact schools. *Roger explained that affordable housing would be incorporated throughout the community and in each phase.*
- Recommended having ethnic neighborhoods (i.e. Mexican American) with fun amenities. Recommended having an architectural competition to design neighborhoods. Indication that Vic Camacho has proposed a Mexican Village concept in Hollister.

- What will happen in Laguna Seca? Recommended using the Laguna Seca as an amphitheater during the dry season. *Jim explained that the Laguna Seca serves as a detention basin and for flood control purposes.*
- What will be the baseline for evaluating the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) alternatives? Concerned with including the CVRP in the existing conditions. Recommended looking at existing conditions from an environmental perspective. Need to look at good planning versus environmental legal issues. Environmental issues should be different from land use issues. *Mike Mena, Planner with the PBCE Department, indicated that the EIR would recognize existing entitlements. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR look at the natural environment. The EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) will be available at the end of May. The scoping meeting will take place after the NOP is released. Susan indicated that there would be an EIR update at the next meeting where this question could be discussed further.*

5. Adjourn

Susan indicated that the next Task Force Meeting will be held on May 9, 2005 and the next TAC meeting would be held on May 17, 2005. She asked for written comments from TAC members by May 2, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.